

REMARKS

Examiner W. Wright is thanked for the thorough examination and search of the subject Patent Application.

Reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is requested in accordance with the following remarks. In the paragraph bridging pages 1 and 2 of the Specification, it is discussed that the prior art uses a combustion process “in a so-called ‘burn box’”. Other patents are said to include burn boxes, including De Santis. In the last paragraph on page 4, it is stated that no burn box is used in the process of the invention. From pages 1-2, it can be construed that “no burn box” means no combustion process since the combustion is performed in a burn box. Therefore, it is believed that the limitation of Claim 30 “without first applying a combustion process” is fully supported by the Specification.

All Claims are believed to be in condition for Allowance, and that is so requested.

Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of Claims 16, 17, and 26-33 as being unpatentable over De Santis is requested in accordance with the following remarks.

It is agreed that Claim 1 of De Santis does not specify that the initial separation process is a combustion process, although claim 9 does claim this. The scrubbing of De Santis takes place within the aspiration section 11 and the orifice section 12 (col. 5, line 60 – col. 6, line 14) of the scrubber shown in Fig. 1. When the gas enters the separation housing 34, it has already been scrubbed (col. 6, lines 21-24). While it is agreed that the silicon dioxide is separated out of the

spent scrubbing liquid in the separation chamber (col. 6, lines 34-42), this is not the same process taught in Applicants' invention. In Applicants' invention, the scrubbing takes place under the water within the water-filled chamber. On page 5 of the Specification, it is taught that the silane gas enters the water-filled chamber under the water (see claims 26, 27, and 30 and Fig. 1, 24). Claim 16 claims that the silane gas is bubbled into the water-filled chamber. This implies that the gas enters the chamber under the water. The reaction of the silane gas with oxygen takes place within the water. The oxygen is dissolved in the water in the chamber. There is no teaching or suggestion in De Santis that the scrubbing take place within the separation chamber 34. Scrubbing takes place within the flow of scrubbing liquid. Applicants' invention does not require the extra complexity of the scrubbing liquid flow and jet pump of De Santis.

Reconsideration of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of Claims 16, 17, and 26-33 as being unpatentable over De Santis is requested in accordance with the remarks above.

Allowance of all Claims is requested.

It is requested that should Examiner Wright not find that the Claims are now Allowable that the Examiner call the undersigned at 765 4530866 to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosemary L. S. Pike
Rosemary L. S. Pike. Reg # 39,332